REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 11-32 are pending.

Claims 1 and 9 is amended.

Claim 10 is cancelled.

Claims 21-32 are added.

Support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found at pages 9-10. Support for the amendment of claim 9 can be found in the specification (pages 6-7, bridging paragraph, the Examples on pages 20-24, Table 1 on page 29); support for claims 21-32 can be found in the Examples at pages 20-24, as originally filed. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Applicants thank the Examiners Miller and McNeil for the discussion conducted on August 8, 2007. All rejections were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments will obviate the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and 103(a). The Examiner pointed out that showing that the Brownhill activated carbon molding is produced by a different method and/or possesses different characteristics is required for overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Brownhill.

The Examiner crossed out the Japanese references listed on the IDS, i.e., JP 9-63907, JP 9-192485, JP 2001-240407, and JP 8-83736, because statements of relevancy have not been submitted with the IDS. Applicants submit English translations attached to this paper of the above identified Japanese application. Applicants kindly request consideration of the above identified Japanese applications.

The rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is addressed by amending claim 1. Applicants submit that the meaning of the limitations "a" and "b" is clear.

Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) over Brownhill, US 4,289,513.

The Examiner alleged that because the Brownhill molding is the same as claimed, it would be expected to have similar properties including a butanol absorption rate (page 4 of the Official Action).

Claims 1-8 are directed to an activated carbon sheet molding obtained by molding an activated carbon sheet made of activated carbon satisfying b/a = 0.3 through 0.55.

Claims 21-26 are directed to methods of making the activated carbon sheet molding obtained by molding an activated carbon sheet made of activated carbon satisfying b/a = 0.3 through 0.55.

Claims 27-32 are directed an activated carbon sheet molding obtained by the methods of claims 21-26, wherein the activated carbon satisfies the ration b/a = 0.3 through 0.55.

Brownhill describes a molding obtained by molding a mixture of an activated carbon, a binder, and a fibrous paper base material (see claim 1). However, Brownhill does not describes that his composition possesses the same property as the claimed molding. Brownhill discloses that the particular functional ability of individual carbon particles is controlled by various factors including temperature, vapor concentration, composition of vapors, and the grade of activated carbon (col. 8, lines 16-19).

The specification describes various fuel evaporation emission preventing devices (pages 1-9). However, they do not provide excellent reduction of the leak amount of fuel vapor, do not low the pressure drop, and do not have excellent moldability and strength (pages 8-9, bridging paragraph). These properties can be achieved by an activated carbon sheet molding made by specific methods and possessing b/a ration from 0.3 to 055.

This specification discloses that even if the same compounds are used for producing the molding, the resultant moldings have different properties because a method of carbon

activation is particularly impotent. Specifically, as illustrated in Table 1 on page 29, the same compounds and the same amount of the compounds is used in Example 1 and Comparative Example 5. However carbon activation time in Example 1 is 12 hours and 6 hours in Comparative Example 5. Table 1 shows that the b/a ratio in Example 1 is 0.395 and the molding is suitable for its intended use, while the b/a ratio in Comparative Example 5 is 0.614 (outside of the claimed range) and the molding is unsuitable. Likewise, carbon compounds in Example 2 and Comparative Example 6 are the same and are used in the same proportion. The activation of carbon in Example 2 is conducted for 10 hours, while in Comparative Example 6 it is 18 hours. The results in Table 2 show that the b/a ratio in Example 2 is 0.358, while the ratio in Comparative Example 6 is 0.288 (outside of the claimed ratio). As a result, the molding of Comparative Example 6 is unsuitable in an evaporation emission preventing device.

The specification also shows that parameters of a corrugated honeycomb molding is important for the performance of the molding, as illustrated in Examples 5-7 and Comparative Example 7-8. In Comparative Example 7, the amount of 3GX activated carbon is reduced compared to Examples 5-7. As a result, the activated carbon of Comparative Example 7 is defective. Also, in Comparative Example 8, a commercially available ceramic honeycomb activated carbon formed by *extrusion* molding and bound in parallel by an adhesive does not satisfy the drop test and is defective. In contrast, the claimed molding is formed by a dry or wet molding method (pages 14-15).

Thus, a method of activation of carbon and a method of forming the carbon molding (method claims 21-26) defines properties of the molding (claims 1-8 and 27-32).

Brownhill does not describe that the activated carbon molding possesses the claimed b/a ratio (present claims 1-8 and 27-32). Brownhill also does not suggest modifying his carbon molding to obtain the claimed b/a ratio.

Brownhill further does not disclose a method of making the activated carbon molding (present claims 21-26).

Brownhill also does not disclose an activated carbon molding made by the claimed methods (present claims 27-32) because the claimed properties are obtained by the clamed methods.

Thus, Brownhill does not anticipate or make the claimed invention obvious. Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brownhill, in view of Kosaka, US, 5,118,329, is unsustainable because neither reference describes an element for a fuel evaporative emission preventing device comprising two canisters connected consecutively, wherein one canister comprises the claimed activated carbon sheet molding and another canister comprises granular activated carbon.

Kosaka discloses a chemically activated shaped carbon. Although Kosaka discloses two canister system illustrated at fig. 1, he does not disclose that a first canister comprises granular activated carbon and a second canister comprises the claimed activated carbon molding, wherein the canisters connected consecutively. The claimed canister arrangement satisfies the required emission value even when a vehicle is parked (page 5-6 of the specification). The Kasaka canisters are connected in parallel and do not comprise different activated carbon. Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Marina I. Miller
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 59,091

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)